

Remarks

Prior to this communication, claims 1 – 45 were pending. By this response, claim 4 has been amended. Examination and reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks are respectfully requested.

U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 1 – 32, and 40 – 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Application Publication No. 2003/0119581 (“Cannon”).

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 1 is directed to “[a] gaming machine system” that includes, among other things, “a plurality of gaming machines linked to the system controller, each gaming machine having a first display and a game controller arranged to control images of symbols displayed on the first display, ...; a second display; and a feature game where, during play of the feature, feature images associated with the feature game are displayed on the second display;” and “a remote display ..., at least certain of the feature images occurring on the second display of a said gaming machine during the playing of the feature game on that gaming machine cooperating with at least certain different feature images displayed on the remote display to communicate an outcome of the feature game on the gaming machine, wherein there are a plurality of different outcomes possible from the feature game and feature images displayed on the remote display during play of the feature game represent that there are a plurality of possible outcomes of the feature game, and wherein the determination of a feature outcome for one of the gaming machines affects a subsequent determination of a feature outcome for another one of the gaming machines.”

Cannon does not anticipate claim 1.

Rather, Cannon discloses that player markers of other players are also displayed in his/her gaming machine on the game display device 178, and interactions between player markers and other markers are displayed on both the game display device 178 and bonus display device 236. For example, Cannon discloses that “[if] multiple players are participating in the bonus game, each player marker is distinct so that each player may easily identify the player marker associated with his or her gaming machine 100, as well as the player markers 410, 415 associated with the gaming machines of other players.” Cannon also discloses that “[each] player may also have multiple player markers 410, 415 associated with his or her gaming machine.”

That is, Cannon does not anticipate at least “feature images associated with the feature game are displayed on the second display,” while “a remote display ..., at least certain of the feature **images occurring on the second display of a said gaming machine** during the playing of the feature game on that gaming machine **cooperating with** at least certain **different feature images displayed on the remote display ...**,” as recited in claim 1. (Emphasis Added.)

Therefore, claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2 – 13 depend from claim 1, and are also allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Similarly, claim 14 is directed to “[a] gaming machine” that includes, among other things, “a second display, arranged apart from the first display,” “a remote display arranged remote from, but visible to a player of, the gaming machine,” and “feature images associated with the feature game are displayed on the second display, at least certain of the feature images occurring on at least one of the displays of at least one of the gaming

machines during the playing of the feature game on the at least one gaming machine cooperating with at least certain different feature images displayed on the remote display.”

Therefore, Cannon does not anticipate at least, “a second display, arranged apart from the first display,” “a remote display arranged remote from, but visible to a player of, the gaming machine,” and “feature images associated with the feature game are displayed on the second display, at least certain of the feature images occurring on at least one of the displays of at least one of the gaming machines during the playing of the feature game on the at least one gaming machine cooperating with at least certain different feature images displayed on the remote display,” as recited in claim 14 in that Cannon discloses that player markers of other players are also displayed in his/her gaming machine on the game display device 178, and interactions between player markers and other markers are displayed on both the game display device 178 and bonus display device 236.

Therefore, claim 14 is allowable.

Claims 15 – 20 depend from claim 14, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Similarly, claim 21 is directed to “[a] method of operating a gaming machine system,” that includes, among other things, “a second display, arranged apart from the first display, a feature game where, during play of the feature, feature images associated with the feature game are displayed on the second display, the feature images being used to communicate an outcome associated with the feature game.” The method includes “causing feature images occurring on at least one of the displays of at least one of the gaming machines during the playing of the feature game on the at least one gaming machine to cooperate with at least certain different feature images occurring on the remote

display and using the feature images in determining a feature outcome on the at least one gaming machine participating in the feature game.”

Therefore, Cannon does not anticipate at least, “[a] method of operating a gaming machine system,” that includes, among other things, “a second display, arranged apart from the first display, a feature game where, during play of the feature, feature images associated with the feature game are displayed on the second display, and “causing feature images occurring on at least one of the displays of at least one of the gaming machines during the playing of the feature game on the at least one gaming machine to cooperate with at least certain different feature images occurring on the remote display and using the feature images in determining a feature outcome on the at least one gaming machine participating in the feature game,” as recited in claim 21, in that Cannon discloses that player markers of other players are also displayed in his/her gaming machine on the game display device 178, and interactions between player markers and other markers are displayed on both the game display device 178 and bonus display device 236.

Accordingly, claim 21 is allowable.

Claim 22 – 39 depend from claim 21, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claim 40 is directed to “[a] gaming machine system” that includes, among other things, “a plurality of gaming machines including a first display and a second display and includes a remote display,” and “the sequence of images representing that the selection affects the outcome of the feature game, at least a portion of the sequence of images displayed on the first display is duplicated on the remote display, and the second display shows an enlarged

representation of at least a portion of the sequence of images displayed on the first display.”

However, Cannon discloses that player markers of other players are also displayed in his/her gaming machine on the game display device 178, and interactions between player markers and other markers are displayed on both the game display device 178 and bonus display device 236.

Accordingly, claim 40 is allowable. Claims 41 – 43 depend from claim 40, and are therefore allowable for at least the reason set forth above.

Claim 44 is directed to “[a] gaming system comprising a plurality of gaming machines linked together, each gaming machine having a first display and a game controller arranged to control images of symbols displayed on the first display, wherein the game controller is arranged to provide a wagering game, the gaming system further comprising a remote display arranged remote from, but visible to a player at each of the plurality of gaming machines, and wherein the gaming system is arranged so that a feature game is provided on a said gaming machine during play of the game on that gaming machine when a trigger condition occurs, the trigger condition being individually determined for each gaming machine so that commencement and play of the feature game on one gaming machine occurs independently of the commencement and play of the feature game on another one of the gaming consoles, wherein representations of the feature game are displayed at least in part on the remote display and wherein a plurality of the gaming machines can participate in the feature game at the same time, in which case representations of the feature game for each gaming machine that is participating in the feature game are simultaneously displayed on the remote display.” Accordingly, claim 44

is allowable in that Cannon discloses that player markers of other players are also displayed in his/her gaming machine on the game display device 178, and interactions between player markers and other markers are displayed on both the game display device 178 and bonus display device 236. Claim 45 depends from claim 44, and is therefore allowable for at least the reason set forth above.

U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 33 – 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cannon.

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As discussed above, claims 33 – 39 depend from claim 21, and are allowable.

Claim 21 is not obvious over Cannon.

Claim 21 is directed to “[a] method of operating a gaming machine system,” that includes, among other things, “a second display, arranged apart from the first display, a feature game where, during play of the feature, feature images associated with the feature game are displayed on the second display, the feature images being used to communicate an outcome associated with the feature game.” The method includes “causing feature images occurring on at least one of the displays of at least one of the gaming machines during the playing of the feature game on the at least one gaming machine to cooperate with at least certain different feature images occurring on the remote display and using the feature images in determining a feature outcome on the at least one gaming machine participating in the feature game.”

Cannon discloses that player markers of other players are also displayed in his/her gaming machine on the game display device 178, and interactions between player markers and other markers are displayed on both the game display device 178 and bonus display device 236. Therefore, Cannon does not teach or suggest, “[a] method of operating a gaming machine system,” that includes, among other things, “a second display, arranged apart from the first display, a feature game where, during play of the feature, feature images associated with the feature game are displayed on the second display, and “causing feature images occurring on at least one of the displays of at least one of the gaming machines during the playing of the feature game on the at least one gaming machine to cooperate with at least certain different feature images occurring on the remote display and using the feature images in determining a feature outcome on the at least one gaming machine participating in the feature game,” as recited in claim 21

Accordingly, claim 21 is allowable in view of Cannon.

Claim 22 – 39 depend from claim 21, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Similarly, Cannon does not teach or suggest claims 40 – 45 for at least the reasons set forth above.

CONCLUSION

Entry of the Amendment and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. The undersigned is available for telephone consultation at any time during normal business hours.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 27, 2009

By: /Larry M. Jarvis/
Larry M. Jarvis
Reg. No. 27,341
Attorney for Applicants

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60661
Phone: (312) 775-8000
Fax: (312) 775-8100